

Copyright  
by  
Noelia Cigarroa-Cooke  
2013

**The Report Committee for Noelia Cigarroa-Cooke  
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**Analysis of presupposition and relevance as mood choice predictors in  
Spanish *Temer(se)* clauses**

**APPROVED BY  
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

**Supervisor:**

---

Orlando Kelm

---

Madeline Sutherland-Meier

**Analysis of presupposition and relevance as mood choice predictors in  
Spanish *Temer(se)* clauses**

**by**

**Noelia Cigarroa-Cooke, BA, MFA**

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Master of Arts**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**August 2013**

## **Dedication**

To my parents: Juana Noelia Dávila de Cigarroa and Rodolfo Cigarroa Cabrera

To my children: Kevin Esten Cooke and Agustín Adams Cooke

To my Texan parents: Peggy and Bill Cooke

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to my supervising committee:

Dr. Kelm and Dr. Sutherland-Meier

Thank you to the following people who helped me at different levels and times:

My Lord Jesus

Pastor Jim Mann

Laura Rodríguez

Dr. Rocío Ocón

Dr. Cinzia Russi

Dr. Jaqueline Toribio

My parents and family: too many to list them here

## **Abstract**

### **Analysis of presupposition and relevance as mood choice predictors in Spanish *Temer(se)* clauses**

Noelia Cigarroa-Cooke, MA

The University of Texas at Austin, 2013

Supervisor: Orlando Kelm

This report examines the dynamic mood alternation attested in fear emotive clauses, i.e. *(Me) temo que mi hija sea/es anoréxica*, ‘I fear/am afraid my daughter (SUBJ/IND) is anorexic’. It does so by using data gathered in electronic sources, implementing two model analyses from the vast literature on the topic and presenting and analyzing the results. It then concludes which of the two chosen models better predicts and clarifies the mood alternation usage for this phrase. The two models come from Terrel and Hooper (1974; Model A) and Lunn (1989 and 1995; Model B). It is expected that one of the two analyses will better explain mood choice patterns for *temer(se)* expressions and, in future research, it may become a validated tool to explain mood variation in other comment clauses as well.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	viii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Andrés Bello (1847).....	3
Francis Lemon (1927).....	3
Dwight Bolinger (1953, 1968).....	4
Henk Haverkate (2002).....	5
Real Academia Española de la Lengua (2009) .....	10
Terrel and Hooper (1974) .....	11
Patricia Lunn (1989) .....	14
RESEARCH QUESTIONS .....	19
METHODOLOGY .....	20
Data collection .....	20
Model A .....	20
Model B .....	23
Data classification criteria.....	24
Data analysis procedure .....	28
DATA RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	29
CONCLUSION.....	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47

## List of Tables

Table 1. Classification of evaluative predicates by Haverkate (2002) .....	6
Table 2. Terrel and Hooper (1974) classification of predicates.....	12
Table 2. Terrel and Hooper (1974) classification of predicates. (This table also appears in page 12) .....	21
Table 3. Analysis of <i>Temer(se)</i> using the semantic Model A (Terrel and Hooper, 1974). .....	29
Table 4. Analysis of <i>Temer(se)</i> using the pragmatic Model B (Lunn 1989). .....	32
Table 5. Analysis of <i>temer(se)</i> by verb type using Model A (Terrel and Hooper, 1974) .....	34
Table 6. Analysis of <i>temer(se)</i> by verb type using model B (Lunn, 1989, 1995)..	37



## INTRODUCTION

The original motivation for this research surfaced when I gathered data for a preliminary study on Spanish comment clauses, which are a class of predicates that generally use subjunctive forms in their embedded clauses, i.e. *(Me) temo que mi hija sea anoréxica*, ‘I fear/am afraid my daughter (SUBJ) is anorexic’. However, scholars have attested a dynamic mood alternation between indicative and subjunctive forms in their subordinated clauses: *(Me) temo que mi hija sea/es anoréxica*, ‘I fear/am afraid my daughter (SUBJ/IND) is anorexic’. The Real Academia Española de la Lengua considers at least 22 verbs in this class<sup>1</sup>, thus I decided to pick one item to further investigate this alternation using a larger number of tokens, instead of examining a larger number of phrases with fewer data items. Fear predicates were chosen because a respected scholar, Henk Haverkate, revealed that the 1<sup>st</sup> singular form in *temerse* (*temo* ‘I fear’), uses the indicative more frequently than subjunctive. Furthermore, he states that *temer* and *temerse* tend to choose a specific mood: *temer* favors subjunctive and *temerse* favors indicative (2002:103). This class of predicates has three shared characteristics: the matrix verb expresses a type of emotion, it takes noun phrases as complements and, if the later contains a subordinated clause, it is found to alternate mood.

However, Haverkate’s observations about *temer(se)* convinced me that we have to separate these expressions to fully understand this issue. For instance, these verbs exhibit different morpho-syntactic features: *temer(se)* is found as a pronominal and non

---

<sup>1</sup> *dar rabia* ‘to feel angry’, *aburrir(se) de* ‘to be bored by’, *apenar(se) de* ‘to feel shame’, *cansar(se) de* ‘to get tired of’, *entristecer(se) de* ‘to be sadden by’, *doler(se) de* ‘to feel pain’, *preocupar(se) de* ‘to be worried about’, *divertir(se)* ‘to have fun’, *encantar* ‘to be delighted by’, *repeler* ‘to repel’, *gustar* ‘to like’, *adorar* ‘to adore’, *amar* ‘to love’, *detestar* ‘to hate’, *lamentar* ‘to lament’, *sentir* ‘to feel empathy for’, *odiar* ‘to hate’, *alegrarse* ‘to be happy about’, *desesperarse* ‘to despair’, *inquietarse* ‘to be anxious about’, *irritarse* ‘to get irritated by’, *interesarse* ‘to be interested in’

pronominal verb that takes noun phrases as complements and, it is rarely used without one; *lamentar* ‘to lament’ and *odiar* ‘to hate’, do not have a pronominal counterpart that takes such complements; *quejarse* ‘to complain’ has evolved to be only pronominal and it takes only prepositional complements, *alegrarse* ‘to be happy’, can be found with prepositional and noun phrases. This is to say that we will be able to learn more about mood variation if we separate these predicates and do single studies that will show a clearer pattern of behavior when it comes to mood choice.

Two models were selected that have been used to explain mood alternation within the vast Spanish mood literature: semantic presupposition (Terrel and Hooper, 1974) and pragmatic relevance (Lunn, 1989 and 1995). These authors were chosen because they offer a compelling analysis with a potential predictive value that could be used, not only to forecast mood choice within fear predicates, but in comment clauses in general.

The purpose of this analysis is to work with data gathered from electronic sources<sup>2</sup>, apply the semantic presupposition and pragmatic relevance analysis to the tokens and conclude which of those models makes a better mood choice predictor for fear and possibly other comment clauses. It is important to find a tool that will provide a better understanding of Spanish mood variation in this type of context. It will have a pedagogical value for instructors and learners of Spanish as a second language.

The following sections, give a brief presentation of some scholars who have examined emotive/comment clauses in the past, including the authors chosen for the analysis.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Real Academia Española de la Lengua* database (CREA), *El corpus del español* by Mark Davis and GOOGLE search.

### **ANDRÉS BELLO (1847)**

Traditional grammars such as Bello's *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana, destinada al uso de los americanos* (1847) prescribe the use of subjunctive when a verb of emotion is utilized:

(1) "...no tiene cabida el indicativo sino el subjuntivo común...porque en estos casos y en otros análogos prevalece sobre la regla que asigna el indicativo a los juicios, la que pide el subjuntivo común para las emociones del ánimo" (Bello 1847:363)

Therefore, according to Bello, the 'correct' choice is always subjunctive after these predicates. There is no list of emotive verbs besides him mentioning *alegrarse* 'to be happy about' and *sentir* 'to feel empathy for'. Furthermore, he does not acknowledge any mood alternation within the complements of such verbs.

### **FRANCIS LEMON (1927)**

Francis Lemon (1927) seems to be the first scholar who discusses the mood alternation in comment clauses with her article "A psychological study on the subjunctive in Spanish". She states that it is difficult to convey the Spanish subjunctive usage to Spanish learners, therefore, after conducting an analysis of current Spanish play dramatists (such as Benavente, Quinteros, Galdós and Sierra) she proposes a 'subjunctive-unifying' factual/ non factual rule, i.e. she designates subjunctive as the mood of non-factual. Lemon acknowledges that 'the use of the subjunctive after verbs of emotion could not be explained after this rule' (1927:196). Although she concedes that French grammarians have confirmed the mood alternation among verbs of emotion in French, i.e. *Je m'afflige de ce qu'il est arrivé* (IND) (1927:198), she goes on to state that the use of indicative with Spanish verbs of fear is 'inadmissible' (1927:198). Lemon argues that these expressions contain a degree of uncertainty or doubt related to the

subordinated clause that precludes them from using indicative forms, thus, the selection of subjunctive.

### DWIGHT BOLINGER (1953, 1968)

Dwight Bolinger (1953) picks up the discussion presented by Lemon decades earlier on Spanish mood alternation, specifically with comment clauses in his “Verbs of emotion” article. He presents the indicative cases for several of these clauses, including fear predicates. Bolinger is the first author to make reference to the reflexive pronoun used in *temerse* ‘to fear (REFL)’ He calls it ‘an auxiliary of certainty’ without elaborating on its syntactic or semantic characteristics (1953:459). This ‘auxiliary of certainty’ proves to be the linguistic clue to the speaker-hearer about the semantic/pragmatic relation of the now called ‘discourse unit’. In a later article, Bolinger (1968) posits that English postponed phrase ‘I’m afraid’ as in ‘(I’m afraid ) we don’t have a lay away service anymore, **I’m afraid**’ is really an example of verbal adverbialization where this and other ‘postposable’ clauses can be readily replaced by an adverb, i.e. ‘unfortunately/sadly/regrettably, we do not have a layaway system anymore (unfortunately/sadly/regrettably)’<sup>3</sup>. Consider the example below:

(2) *Me temo que ya no contamos con un sistema de apartado* ‘**I’m afraid/unfortunately** we don’t **have** (IND) a layaway system anymore’

Regarding (2) above, Bolinger establishes a rule for the indicative/subjunctive Spanish alternation: if English allows the postposition of a phrase like ‘we don’t have a lay away service anymore, **I’m afraid**’, it follows that its Spanish counterpart will take

---

<sup>3</sup> (2) above could be an utterance that fits his adverbialization proposal because in Spanish, we can also replace *me temo* by an adverb, such as *desafortunadamente*, *desgraciadamente*, *lamentablemente*, etc, and, as Haverkate has pointed out, the clause can be deleted when used as a polite utterance, just like an optional adverbial phrase.

the indicative. If the verbal phrase cannot be ‘postposed’ as in ‘I’m sorry you lost it (\*I’m sorry)’, then it follows that the Spanish counterpart will use subjunctive: *Siento/lamento que lo hayas perdido/perdieras* (PRES PERF/PAST SUBJ)<sup>4</sup>. This ingenious syntactic tool is not completely accurate, as one can imagine, but establishes good ground for the consideration of English word order, the adverbial properties of some English/Spanish verbal phrases and their correlation to Spanish mood alternation. Thanks to Bolinger’s proposal, it can be stated that fear clauses in the indicative are not only functioning as assertive and polite alternates but also as adverbial phrases within the discourse unit.

#### **HENK HAVERKATE (2002)**

This scholar scrutinizes mood alternation in Spanish and pays special attention to emotive clauses. Henk Haverkate 2002 (Haverkate 02 hereafter) retakes all of the studies previous to his work and includes pragmatics, semantics and syntax to explain mood choice in noun phrases. This author classifies mental acts and comment complements in different categories: Mental acts belong to acquisition of knowledge predicates and comment clauses belong to emotional evaluations. He specifies even farther between those evaluative predicates in order to see the differences of behavior:

---

<sup>4</sup> Bolinger’s rule breaks down for this example because standard Spanish alternates between indicative and subjunctive: *Siento/lamento que lo has perdido/perdiste* (IND)

Evaluation predicates	Rational evaluations	Quantitative, Qualitative Deontic
	Emotional evaluations	Negative: <i>enojar</i> ‘to get mad’, <i>molestar</i> , <i>chocar</i> ‘to be bothered’, <i>dar asco</i> ‘to be disgusted’, <i>entristecer</i> ‘to get sad’  Positive: <i>gustar</i> ‘to like’, <i>encantar</i> ‘to really like something’, <i>alegrar</i> ‘to be happy about something’

Table 1. Classification of evaluative predicates by Haverkate (2002)

According to Haverkate 02, the difference between these two sets of evaluation predicates resides mainly, but not exclusively, in the syntactic structure. Prototypical emotional evaluations exhibit the following syntactic properties:

- Two place predicates (subject/direct or indirect object): *Me alegra(o) que estudies/estudias tanto* ‘I am glad (that) you study (SUBJ/IND) so much’
- Reflexive verbs with a prepositional phrase: *Se queja de que le hacen/hagan poco caso* ‘he complains about them not paying(IND/SUBJ) enough attention to him’, and
- Impersonal expressions: *Es lamentable que le hagan poco caso* ‘it is a shame that they don’t pay (SUBJ) enough attention to him’.

The author presents rational evaluation prototypes as impersonal expressions like quantitative *ser frecuente* ‘to be frequent’, qualitative *ser extraño* ‘to be strange’ and deontic *ser preciso* ‘it is important/mandatory’. As far as mood choice, according to the author’s analysis, the qualitative expression *ser extraño* and the two place emotional

predicates mentioned above allow indicative mood when the main clause becomes defocalized (back grounded, see below) by virtue of the use of a cleft construction<sup>5</sup>:

(3) *Lo extraño es que no me has visto en el bar* ‘The strange thing is that you have not seen me(Perf IND) at the bar.

(4) *Lo que le enoja es que sus hijos llegan tarde a casa* ‘What makes her mad is that her children come back (IND) home late’

In summary, Haverkate 02 claims that, in addition to the syntactic differences between rational and emotional predicates, another important distinction is the mood behavior: the rational expressions are less likely to allow indicative mood than the emotional kind. But, before going any further, the author’s perspective on the so called foregrounding and backgrounding strategies is given next.

Haverkate explains his analysis in terms of backgrounding and foregrounding information:

- Foreground: relevant, central, salient, focalized information.
- Background: information that elaborates on or develops foreground information or defocalizes it.

He states that the choice of mood for emotional comment clauses is correlated with a foregrounding or backgrounding process: the use of subjunctive on these complements does not denote focalization or foregrounding of the subordinate clause BUT that of the matrix one. He acknowledges that the complement is “part of the cognitive domain of both: speaker and hearer” (2002: 101). Indicative, then, will tilt the

---

<sup>5</sup> To me, the cleft construction does not allow more indicative use than its simpler counterpart structure: *?Es extraño que no me has visto en el bar* ‘It is strange that you haven’t seen me(Pres Perf IND) at the bar’ or *Le enoja que sus hijos llegan tarde a casa* ‘It makes her mad that her children come back(IND) home late’

‘attention’ to the complement even though it encodes information that is known by both participants. Haverkate 02 uses the following example to clarify his view:

(5) *Es extraño que no me **haya visto** en el bar* ‘It is strange that you **have not seen** me (Pres Perf SUBJ) at the bar’

He explains that the content of the embedded proposition is backgrounded or defocalized: the speaker is making a value judgment of the information already known by the hearer. This account is similar to Lavandera’s (1983) centrality and peripherality dichotomy<sup>6</sup> and Lunn’s relevance theory (1989, 1995); with the difference that Haverkate also refers to the speaker-created syntactic ‘tilting’ of attention, i.e. indicative highlights the subordinate clause and subjunctive emphasizes the main clause. He, then, analyses the clefted version mentioned before:

(6) *Lo extraño es que no me **has visto** en el bar* ‘The strange thing is that you **have not seen** me (Pres Perf IND) at the bar’.

He argues that the subjunctive version of the sentence in (5) presents information already known to the hearer that he chooses not to highlight. The indicative use in (6), on the other hand, entails a foregrounding strategy, i.e. the speaker chooses to emphasize the information in the embedded clause.

The author also analyses other verbs that he considers part of the emotional evaluation class: *comprender* ‘to understand/comprehend’, *esperar* ‘to hope for’, *confiar* ‘to trust’ and the main topic of this analysis: *temer* ‘to fear/ be afraid of’. He groups these predicates together because they offer polysemy regarding mood choice.

(7) a ***Me temo** (Pres IND) que **has llegado** (Pres Perf IND) tarde* ‘**I’m afraid** you **have arrived** late’ (Haverkate’s example 169:103)

---

<sup>6</sup> This scholar states that indicative use signals the centrality of the information and subjunctive the low relevance or peripherality of it.



b **Comprendo** (Pres IND) *que la política es* (Pres IND) *un tema polémico pero no se puede evitar* ‘**I think/I believe/I know** that politics **is** a controversial topic but we cannot avoid it’

Vs.

- (8) a **Me temo** (Pres IND) *además... que sus gestos de buena voluntad... no encuentren* (Pres SUBJ) *apoyo en el resto del Gobierno* ‘**I fear** that his good will gestures **won’t/might not find** support among other government officials’. (Haverkate example 168:102)

b **Comprendo** (Pres IND) *que la política sea* (Pres SUBJ) *un tema polémico pero no se puede evitar* ‘**I understand** that politics is a controversial topic but we cannot avoid it’

Haverkate 02 notes an important feature illustrated by the use of subjunctive in example (8a): it evokes a hypothetical state of affairs or what Givón (1994) calls ‘potentialis’ interpretation. The author then, attributes the use of subjunctive not to the need to background known information but to the hypothetical nature of the complement.

He also points out that the use of indicative in *temer(se)* clauses causes a mitigating effect since there are other means to express an idea but the speaker chooses the less direct, i.e.:

- (9) **Llegaste/llegas/has llegado tarde** ‘You arrived (Past IND)/arrive (IND)/have arrived (Perf IND) late’

Vs.

- (10) **Me temo que llegaste/llegas/has llegado tarde**. ‘**DM/I’m afraid** you arrived (Pret IND)/arrive (Pres IND) have arrived (Pres Perf IND) late’

He affirms that on (10), a politeness strategy asserts the information contained in the complement clause and, at the same time softens the effect of a direct utterance such as the one in (9). As an added proof of the difference between (9) and (10), Haverkate shows that the main clause in (10) can be omitted since it is used as a politeness strategy, but its omission is impossible in (8a) because, according to him, the intended meaning is

that of a ‘potentialis’ interpretation, thus, lacks the politeness purpose seen in (10). This scholar is implicitly assigning a potentialis meaning to the use of subjunctive and a polite assertion to the indicative one.

Haverkate 02 is the only academic that has analyzed comment clauses in any detail as to offer a clear and meticulous account of its mood alternation. He states that *temer* and *temerse* tend to choose a specific mood: *temer* favors subjunctive and *temerse* favors indicative (2002: 103). The two models chosen will corroborate/disprove this author’s claim about *temer(se)*.

Haverkate summarizes his findings as follows:

(11) “In sentences containing an evaluation predicate, backgrounding of the content of the embedded proposition requires the use of subjunctive, whereas, foregrounding of the content, which is triggered by specific syntactic or contextual factors, requires the use of indicative...There is a basic mechanism involved in the distribution of Spanish mood: the use of indicative correlates with a high or a relatively high degree information value, while the use of the subjunctive correlates with a low or a relatively low degree of information value” (2002:104-105)

This scholar’s view of the mood alternation is very similar if not identical to that of Lunn (1989, 1995), which will be addressed in a later section.

#### **REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA DE LA LENGUA (2009)**

The last account of comment clauses reviewed here comes from the new grammar issued by La Real Academia Española de la Lengua: *Nueva gramática de la Lengua española* (2009), which affirms that:

(12) “...las subordinadas encabezadas por **que** introducen a veces el indicativo con los verbos mencionados [*molestar, alegrar, preocupar*], más frecuentemente en el español americano que en el europeo.” ‘subordinated clauses headed by **that** sometimes use indicative with the verbs before mentioned [to be bothered by, to be happy about, to be worried about] more frequently found in Latin American speakers than in European ones’ (RAE 2009: 1895)

The Academia states that these indicative uses with emotive verbs are ‘scarce exceptions’ (2009:1882), nevertheless, it dedicates two sections to *temer* (2009:1896, 25.5d and 25.5e). It also acknowledges the existence of *temer* and *temerse* and the fact that mood alternation is possible for both. This Spanish grammar explains the *temer(se)* subjunctive/indicative alternation in semantic grounds: subjunctive use entails a notion of fear (emotive) and indicative denotes a sense of ‘suspicion or distrust’ (assertive). Despite the claim of ‘scarce exceptions’ cited before, the grammar explains that ‘the employment of indicative ascends remarkably with pronominal verb *temerse...*’ (2009:1896).

The Real Academia Española de la Lengua insists on the ‘exceptional’ nature of the indicative/subjunctive variation among emotive verb complements.

#### **TERREL AND HOOPER (1974)**

Terrel and Hooper in their seminal article “A Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish” (1974), offer a semantic model analysis that classifies and predicts the mood choice of different Spanish predicates based on the notions of presupposition and assertion. They match Spanish independent/dependent clauses to either subjunctive or indicative under those semantic concepts, explicitly correlating assertion/+presupposition with indicative/subjunctive morphology and -presupposition with subjunctive forms. Terrel and Hooper further explain that speakers make a mood choice according to their beliefs about the truth value of the proposition as a whole. These authors argue that speakers adopt an attitude towards a proposition and choose not only the form of the subordinate clause but also the kind of matrix they need to convey their chosen attitude. They consider assertion as the **affirmation** of the truth value of the clause and presupposition as a **comment** on the truth value of the proposition. Table 2

below presents their classification chart which correlates to the different attitudes a speaker can adopt:

Semantic notion	Class of predicate	Mood choice
+ assertion	(1) assertion	Indicative
	(2) report	Indicative
+ presupposition	(3) Mental acts	Indicative
	(4) Comment	Subjunctive
Neither: - presupposed - asserted	(5) Doubt	Subjunctive
	(6) Imperative	Subjunctive

Table 2. Terrel and Hooper (1974) classification of predicates.

This often quoted chart shows how each class of predicate is correlated to a semantic feature and a morphological one. It works as follows: If the speakers presuppose the subordinate clause to be true then, they will use indicative/subjunctive and the proposition will have the feature + presupposed. If the speakers assert the truth value of the clause, they select indicative instead and that utterance will have the feature + asserted. If the speakers neither assert nor presuppose the utterance, they will use subjunctive and the clause will be non-presupposed and will have the feature - presupposed. These are some samples that correspond to each of the 6 categories listed above:

1. **Assertions:**

**a)** *Sé que Pedro tiene mucho dinero invertido* 'I know that Peter has (IND) a lot of money invested'

**b)** *Es cierto que hay vida en otros planetas* 'It is true that there is (IND) life in other planets'

- c) *Me parece que trabaja los martes y jueves* 'I think she works (IND) Tuesdays and Thursdays
2. **Reports:**  
*Me dijo que iba a ir al cine* 'He told me that he was going (IND) to the movies'
3. **Mental Acts:**  
 a) *Se dio cuenta de que había mucho dinero* 'He realized that there was (IND) a lot of money'  
 b) *No toma en consideración que no tengo tiempo de comer* 'He doesn't take into account that I don't have(IND) time to eat'
4. **Comments:**  
 a) *Temo que sea demasiado tarde para hacer cambios económicos* 'I fear that is (SUBJ) too late to make any financial changes'  
 b) *Me alegra que hayas ido al doctor* 'I'm happy that you went (SUBJ) to the doctor'.
5. **Doubt:**  
*Dudo que quiera ir al cine hoy* 'I doubt that she wants (SUBJ) to go to the movies today
6. **Imperative:**  
*No te preocupes por nada* 'Don't worry (SUBJ) about a thing'

Terrel and Hooper (1974) predict that, when the system stabilizes, the comment clauses will all use indicative, and consequently, the only predicates that will make use of the subjunctive will be the ones that are non-presupposed. They conclude that "...then the indicative will be consistently associated with assertion and presupposition and the subjunctive with the lack of these attitudes" (1974:488). Thus, the authors implicitly assume subjunctive erosion/loss within comment clauses in general.

The goal of this analysis is to test this classification/model and determine its value as a predictor of mood choice among *temer(se)* clauses. *Temer(se)* predicates are considered part of the comment clause group (4 above) but the data samples show that some of these phrases are "weak assertions" (thus, some of them were considered to be mental acts as in 3 above) and in many other cases are non presupposed utterances (as in

5 and 6 above). The data was classified according to Terrel and Hooper's semantic approach: presupposed (mental act/comment) and non-presupposed clauses.

### **PATRICIA LUNN (1989)**

Patricia Lunn (1989) offers an analysis of mood choice within an assertion prototype: she studies the clauses in a context, not just a sentence, and retakes the notions of assertion and presupposition giving a scalar account of assertability. This scholar does not examine comment clauses in particular but posits an analysis that can potentially predict mood choice if applied to other environments where there is attested alternation.

She differs from Terrel and Hooper (1974) in 4 important ways:

a) For Lunn, the question is not "when must subjunctive be used?" but "Why is subjunctive used?" (In this, she follows Lavandera, 1983)

b) Lunn breaks with traditional analyses that only examine the sentence and considers the contextual information as a very decisive part in mood choice.

c) She redefines assertion and presupposition in the following terms:

- Presupposition refers to old information: information that the speaker assumes is already known by the hearer or information that the former considers not very important. This definition encompasses speaker and hearer and their assumed knowledge about the topic being discussed, hence, the truth value is not the only consideration made as far as presupposition is concerned. In syntactic terms it refers to thematization since it is conveying old information.
- Assertion refers to new information: information that the speaker considers important or that he assumes the hearer does not know. These propositions have a positive truth value (in semantic terms). In syntactic terms it refers to rematization since it conveys new information.

d) She sees assertion as a scalar phenomenon not as the absence (-) or presence (+) of this feature. She says that:

(13) “Potentially assertable information must have two qualities: it must be both reliable as of truth value and informative as to news value. If it is lacking either of these two qualities...it is unlikely to be asserted” (1989:691).

She offers the following scale to explain her view:

Less assertable-----Assertable-----Less assertable  
Untrue -----both true and new-----old.

Lunn (1989) states that indicative mood encodes highly relevant assertable information that can be both: true and new; consequently, subjunctive mood will encode lower relevance, less assertable information and explains that the truth and ‘news’ value can make information less or more assertable. To this author ‘newness’ correlates with high relevance and ‘oldness’ with low relevance.

After setting and justifying her notions of assertion and presupposition, Lunn proceeds to demonstrate her theory of assertability and relevance successfully analyzing relative clauses. She accounts for the alternation of preterit/past subjunctive and past subjunctive –re vs. past subjunctive –se. The author uses data gathered from Spanish magazines (*Hola*) and demonstrates that past subjunctive is used when certain characteristics are met within the contexts of the ‘news’ or the topic at hand. If the information was given before (and past (preterite) indicative was used) then the body of the text will repeat the propositions using past subjunctive. This is similar to Lavandera’s notion of centrality and peripheralality since the repetition of information entails subjunctive use:

(14) “**Headline:** *la bandera que besó, es la que, en su día, también besó el rey don Juan Carlos...* ‘The flag was kissed by him, which in its day was also kissed (Pret IND) by King Juan Carlos...’

“**Text:** *Y al final besó la bandera roja y gualda que hace 30 años besara su padre el rey y que un día bordara...*” Tomado de *Hola* 26-10-85 ” ‘At the end he kissed the red and yellow flag that had been kissed(Past SUBJ) by his father the king 30 years ago and which was embroidered (Past SUBJ) by...’ (1989, p. 693)

For this author, the mood shifting showed above “emerges from the need to emphasize or deemphasize information in discourse” (1989:700). Frederick Hensey, professor emeritus (Personal Communication), argues that this is not really a subjunctive form when it’s used in this context because it counts as an alternative to preterit/pluperfect indicative as the English translation strongly suggests. Even if examples such as (14) above denote a temporal difference, as opposed to a mood distinction, Lunn replies:

(15) “... even as far back as the twelfth-century *Poema de mio Cid*, the –ra form was used to background information (repeated information, description of minor incidents, common knowledge), in contrast with the analytic Romance pluperfect (*había sido*, ‘Had been’), which was used to highlight plot developments” (1989:692)

She also offers an example of scalar assertability using -ra and –se alternations in literature: she explains that the two past subjunctive forms differ in the degree of assertiveness they comprise. According to her analysis the form –se is the less assertive, more polite form and -ra is the more assertive, more direct form. She uses a detective novel by Manuel Vázquez Montalbán, *La soledad del manager*, written in 1977, and gives the following examples to substantiate her claim:

(16) a) “***Quisiera*** que recordaras primero si ha sido cliente tuyo o si puedes preguntárselo a alguna colega...” ‘ **I would like** for you to remember (Past SUBJ) if he has been your client in the first place...’



b)“*Quisiera que usted me aclarase algunas cosas...*” ‘**I would like** for you to clarify (Past SUBJ) to me some issues...’ (1989:696)

Lunn’s analysis tries to accommodate and explain different shades of meaning and assertability in utterances such as the examples mentioned above and also some exceptional uses of subjunctive like *quisiera hacerle una pregunta*, ‘I would like to ask you a question’. She calls this subjunctive usage a “discretionary non assertion” strategy where the speaker chooses not to assert assertable information to produce a polite effect in his request.

Finally, Lunn states that “A theory that can explain data that other theories leave unexplained is a superior theory” (1989:700). She implicitly opens the predictability door to other environments that show these interesting mood alternations, thus, it was decided to use her tenets to find out if her model can expound and predict mood variation within comment clauses, just as it explained/predicted her results with regards to relative clauses.

Among the studies previously mentioned, Terrel and Hooper (1974) and Lunn (1989) set the best groundwork for this current study since:

1. Terrel and Hooper’s model has been mentioned and/or revisited by a number of scholars. Despite the objections their approach has endured, it is considered a solid advance toward a better understanding of the Spanish mood alternation in unstable contexts, such as comment clauses.

2. Patricia Lunn’s analysis feeds on the semantic notions posited by Terrel and Hooper (1974) but makes important pragmatic additions: she owes a debt to previous work of remarkable scholars like Lavandera (1983) and Sperber and Wilson (1986) with regards to relevance/value of information and the strategies used to foreground or

background it in discourse. Haverkate (2002) is one of many other scholars who retakes this model and concludes that:

(11) “In sentences containing an evaluation predicate, backgrounding of the content of the embedded proposition requires the use of subjunctive, whereas, foregrounding of the content, which is triggered by specific syntactic or contextual factors, requires the use of indicative...There is a basic mechanism involved in the distribution of Spanish mood: the use of indicative correlates with a high or a relatively high degree information value, while the use of the subjunctive correlates with a low or a relatively low degree of information value” (2002: 104-105)

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The previous literature review presents a small amount of scholarly research that has ignited a dynamic discussion about mood alternation which, according to some of these studies, has not been properly accounted for. The vast amount of literature related to Spanish mood in general<sup>7</sup> suggests a substantial curiosity and desire to explain this complex issue by putting forward better tools for its understanding. Thus, the data presented here has been at the heart of the ongoing debate for several decades. This report would like to answer two simple questions in its examination of the issue:

1. Is there a viable analysis model one can utilize to better understand mood alternation in fear and possibly other comment clauses?
2. Is it feasible to predict mood choice within fear clauses using one of those authors' models?

If the answer is 'yes' to those questions, then, we will have a valuable tool to understand this intricate mood alternation. The successful model can be applied to other comment clauses and supply the student/instructor with a predictable pattern that can be better learned and used in everyday conversations.

If the answer is 'no', then, we will have to keep searching for other proposals within the ever growing literature on the matter.

---

<sup>7</sup> Terrel (1976), Lavandera (1983), Takagaki (1984), Lunn (1989, 1991 and 1995), Ahern (2004), Blake (1981, 1985), Dunlap (2006), González-Salinas (2002), Gregory (2001), Guitart (1984), Klein-Andreu (1991), Lynch (1999), Quer (2009), Ross-Veidmark (1991), Silva-Corvalán (1994), Jary (2009), Villalta (2008), Siegel (2009), just to mention a few...

## METHODOLOGY

### DATA COLLECTION

300 sample clauses were gathered for this study. The tokens came from three sources: the CREA database available at La Real Academia Española de la lengua's website, *El corpus del español* by Mark Davis and the Google search engine available on the internet. The data was collected by entering a conjugated form of *temer(se)* 'to fear/be afraid', i.e. *temo que*, 'I fear/am afraid'; *temes que*, 'you fear/are afraid', etc. Only the most recent queries were kept (those ranging from 2000 to date).

After the data collection, a careful consideration of the relevant literature was conducted and two analyses were chosen. The later were used to examine and classify the data to answer the research questions mentioned before:

1. Is there a viable analysis model one can utilize to better understand mood alternation in fear and possibly other comment clauses?
2. Is it feasible to predict mood choice within fear clauses using one of those authors' models?

### MODEL A

Terrel and Hooper (1974) provided us with an influential blue print in their article "A Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish". They built up a semantic system to successfully classify and predict mood choice in different Spanish predicates based on the notions of presupposition and assertion. They consider assertion as the **affirmation** of the truth value of the clause and presupposition as a **comment** on the truth value of the proposition. For the sake of clarity I present again their classification chart:

Semantic notion	Class of predicate	Mood choice
+ assertion	(1) assertion	Indicative
	(2) report	Indicative
+ presupposition	(3) Mental acts	Indicative
	(4) Comment	Subjunctive
Neither: - presupposed - asserted	(5) Doubt	Subjunctive
	(6) Imperative	Subjunctive

Table 2. Terrel and Hooper (1974) classification of predicates. (This table also appears in page 12)

They explain their classification as follows: If the speakers presuppose the subordinate clause to be true then, they will use indicative/subjunctive and the proposition will have the feature + presupposed. If the speakers assert the truth value of the clause, they select indicative instead and that utterance will have the feature + asserted. If the speakers neither assert nor presuppose the utterance, they will use subjunctive and the clause will be non-presupposed and will have the feature - presupposed.

Terrel and Hooper (1974) predict that, when the system stabilizes, the comment clauses will all use indicative, and, consequently, the only predicates that will make use of the subjunctive will be the ones that are non-presupposed. They conclude that “...then the indicative will be consistently associated with assertion and presupposition and the subjunctive with the lack of these attitudes” (Terrel and Hooper 1974:488).

*Temer(se)* predicates are considered part of the comment clause group (4 above). One example from the collected data is (17) below:

(17)149<sup>8</sup>. *El personal de relaciones públicas del Banco Mundial enfrenta ahora el reto de convencer a la gente de que el nuevo presidente es independiente de la Administración Bush y sus políticas controversiales. **Tememos que "democracia" estará entre las palabras de moda en el Banco, y será la base para establecer una nueva serie de condicionamientos, principalmente en el Medio Oriente.*** ‘PR personnel from the World Bank face the challenging task of convincing people that the new president is not related to the Bush administration and its controversial policies. We fear that ‘democracy’ will be among the fashionable words in the Bank and it will be the foundation to establish a new series of conditions imposed mainly in the Middle East’.

The speakers in (17) take the subordinated clause *estará entre las palabras de moda en el Banco...* as true and make a fearful/apprehensive comment about it. Thus, under Terrel and Hooper’s definition, this one is an example of a presupposed statement being commented on.

However, the data samples show that some of these phrases are "weak assertions", thus, they can be part of the mental act in group 3. The following example is one of many that were classified as weak assertions:

(18) 20. ***me temo que vuestra psicopatía es más pronunciada de lo que pensaba, porque sufrís graves alucinaciones.*** ‘I’m afraid your psychopathic tendencies are stronger than I ever thought because you suffer serious hallucinations as well... (<http://www.opuslibros.org/nuevaweb>, Spain, 2004)

The speaker in example (18) is cautiously **asserting, not commenting** upon the truth value of the embedded clause *vuestra psicopatía es más pronunciada de lo que pensaba*, i.e. the speaker believes the embedded statement is true and ‘politely’ asserts it as so. Comment clauses are correlated to an emotional reaction to presupposed utterances and the example given above does not convey such an emotive response to the presupposed expression given by the speaker. The tokens that exhibit this non-

---

<sup>8</sup> This number corresponds to a specific token in the collected data; the one in parenthesis denotes the sequence of citations.

emotionally related reaction to a presupposed clause were classified as mental acts (group 3 above).

Many other cases in the data can be classified as non-presupposed utterances (groups 5 and 6 above), under Terrel and Hooper's definition. Consider example (19):

(19) 216. *Los consumidores del mundo entero están furiosos por los altos precios del combustible. Más aún, **temen que lo peor esté por venir**. Los ministros de la Organización de Países Exportadores de Petróleo (OPEP) se reunirán el próximo domingo, pero no se espera que lo que acuerden vaya a aliviar esta situación.*  
'The world's consumers are furious because of the high gas prices. More over they fear that the worse may still be coming. The OPEP leaders will meet next Sunday, but nobody expects that their agreements will alleviate the situation'

The consumers (*los consumidores*) in example (19) do not commit to the truth value of the embedded clause, i.e. the forecasted outcome *lo peor esté por venir*' could be true or not, (the speaker does not commit to one truth value either), thus 'non-presupposed'. The tokens found to have this lack of assertion and commitment to the truth value of the subordinated clause were classified as 'non-presupposed'.

## MODEL B

Patricia Lunn (1989) offers an analysis of mood choice within a pragmatic assertion prototype: she studies the clauses in a context, not just as isolated sentences, and redefines the notions of assertion and presupposition proposed by Terrel and Hooper (1974).

She describes assertion and presupposition as pragmatic concepts, not as the semantic notions given previously by Terrel and Hooper (1974):

- Presupposition refers to old information: information that speakers assume is already known by hearers or information that the former consider not

very important. It also refers to facts that have been mentioned within the exchange context of the participants.

- Assertion refers to new information: information that the speaker considers important or that he assumes the hearer does not know. It is also information that has not been mentioned within the exchange context between participants.

Lunn states that indicative mood encodes highly relevant assertable information; consequently, subjunctive mood will encode lower relevance, less assertable information. Therefore, ‘newness’ correlates with high relevance and ‘oldness’ with low relevance.

Lunn then, proceeds to analyze Spanish relative clauses and conditionals using her Relevance model as a prototype to predict/explain mood choice. She successfully accounts for the alternation of preterit/past subjunctive in a series of articles from a well known Spanish magazine (*Hola*). She demonstrates that past subjunctive is used when certain characteristics are met within the contexts of the ‘news’ or the topic at hand. If the information was given before (and past indicative was used because it was new information) then the body of the text will repeat the propositions using past subjunctive.

The data was classified in two categories: “new/relevant information” vs. “old/less non-relevant information” instead of “presupposed” vs. “asserted” to avoid confusion between the semantic definitions given in our previous model.

#### **DATA CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA**

The data entries were classified using the following categories for Model A:



	subjunctive
Mental Act	
<b>Presupposed</b>	indicative
	subjunctive
Comment clause	
	indicative
	subjunctive
<b>Non-presupposed</b>	
	indicative

The criteria used to classify the samples in the semantic categories displayed above are the following:

a) A sample was classified as a Presupposed Mental Act when the context and clause clearly show the speaker's affirmation and or commitment to the truth value of the utterance in question, i.e, the speakers/subjects hold the dependent clause as true and use the main clause to assert their conviction and not to comment on an emotional state:

(20) 251. *Hola, soy el doctor Vance. - Oh, celebro que haya llegado, doctor. Soy Jenny Langer. - Encantado... Tengo una cita con su padre. - Oh, no, no... Mi padre ha fallecido. - Perdone. Lo siento mucho... Entonces con su marido. - No estoy casada. - ¿No? Entonces... debe de ser con su hermano. - No, mi hermano es decorador de interiores. Verá, doctor, **me temo que su cita es conmigo**: soy la doctora Jenny Langer.* " 'Hello. I am Doctor Vance. -Oh I'm happy that you have arrived doctor. I am Jenny Langer. -Nice to meet you...I have an appointment with your father.- Oh no, no,...my father has died. - I am very sorry...then your husband.-I am not married.- No? Then my appointment must be with your brother. -No, my brother is an interior designer.-See, doctor, I'm afraid your appointment is with me: I am Doctor Jenny Langer.' (From: Prensa, El País. Ciberpaís, 20/03/2003: CIENCIA FICCIÓN, Spain)

b) A token was classified as a presupposed comment expression when the context and clause clearly show the speaker's affirmation and/or commitment to the truth value

of the utterance in question, i.e, the speakers/subjects hold the dependent clause as true and use the main clause to comment or display an emotional state:

(21) 61. *Confiesa Lady Gaga a Vanity Fair: ‘temo que el sexo agotaría mi creatividad’ Tengo una idea rara que si me acuesto con alguien se va a apoderar de mi creatividad a través de mi vagina*”. ‘Lady Gaga discloses to Vanity Fair: “I fear that a sexual act would deplete my creativity...I have this weird idea that if I sleep with somebody, he/she will get my creativity through my vagina’ (From: elmolinoonline.com)

c) An item was classified as a non-presupposed expression when the context and clause clearly show a lack of commitment by the speaker to the truth value of the utterance in question, i.e, the speakers/subjects forecast an event without compromising their clause as a true statement, thus it is neither a weak assertion nor an emotional comment (it could be considered an attempt at speculation):

(22) 219. *Quizás veamos más señales de repudio al viciado proceso electoral peruano, a pesar de la tímida reacción inicial de los países latinoamericanos. Estados Unidos, Canadá, Argentina y algunas otras democracias de la región temen que una regresión del Perú a un sistema totalitario podría alentar a otros aspirantes a presidentes vitalicios en la región a perpetuarse en el poder por medios poco democráticos*. “Maybe, we might see more signs of disapproval about the corrupted electoral system in Peru, despite the initial timid reaction of other Latin-American countries. The United States, Canada, Argentina and some other democratic nations in the area are afraid that a regression to a totalitarian regime in Peru could encourage other political candidates to perpetuate their terms using less democratic means” (from: Prensa, El Nuevo Herald, 24/07/2000, ‘La merecida soledad de Fujimori’, EE.UU)

The data was classified in two categories using Model B: “new/relevant information” vs. “old/less non-relevant information” instead of “presupposed” vs. “asserted” to avoid confusion between the semantic definitions given in our previous model.

:

subjunctive

**Old/less relevant information**

indicative

subjunctive

**New/highly relevant information**

indicative

The criteria used to classify the samples in the pragmatic categories displayed above are as follows:

a) An expression was classified as Old/less, non-relevant information when through the context before the dependent clause there was an explicit reference to the information contained in it:

(23) 276. *El debate sobre el Estatuto Docente es un buen ejemplo de cómo los errores de ayer pueden convertirse en nuestra cruz de mañana, a menos que el análisis de los legisladores depure el texto de toda intención de caer simpáticos a los numerosos docentes de escuelas públicas para lograr réditos políticos. Pero **temo que ese no será el caso**, por lo que se ve hasta ahora.* ‘The debate about Education Laws is a good example of past mistakes that could become our future struggles, unless the legislator’s analysis’ purges the text from all attempts to acquire political gain from teachers in public school systems. But I’m afraid that won’t be the case for what we’ve seen so far’ (from: Prensa, ABC Color, 03/07/2001, ‘¿Tienen coronita?’ Paraguay)

b) An expression was classified as New/highly relevant information when through the context before the dependent clause there was no explicit reference to the information included in it:

(24) 18. *La televisión británica empezó a emitir a partir de hoy un anuncio publicitario dirigido a luchar contra el vicio de fumar entre los padres. La voz de una niña dice: "No temo la obscuridad", "**temo que mi mamá se muera**"* ‘British TV started an anti-smoking campaign geared to parents. The voice of a girl says

“I’m not afraid of the dark, I’m afraid my mom may die” (From: 20minutos.tv/video/, 3.10.2010.

All of the items that did not comply with these selection criteria were eliminated from the data set. There were no boundaries delimited for the tokens’ sources, i.e. all text, video and blogs were considered.

#### **DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE**

The 300 samples collected were classified twice: once using the categories described for Model A (semantic) and the second time using the groups described for Model B (pragmatic). In addition, the tokens were divided by the verb type: pronominal form *temerse* and the non pronominal counterpart *temer* to confirm or rebuke Haverkate’s claim regarding these two verbs.

These two models predict a certain output as it has been explained before. Model A predicts that presupposed clauses will use indicative or will trend to indicative, while non-presupposed expressions will use subjunctive. Model B predicts that old/less relevant information will use subjunctive and new/highly relevant information will use indicative. The results were assigned a percentage, which show the category with the highest number of observed instances (being subjunctive or indicative). The following section contains the tables and discussion of the final results.

## DATA RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following table presents the outcome obtained using the semantic Model A (Terrel and Hooper, 1974). The three categories display a very strong tendency to the predicted result: Presupposed mental acts use indicative in almost 99% of the tokens, presupposed comment items use indicative 74% of the time and non-presupposed expressions use subjunctive in almost 87% of the non-presupposed total items. Model A can be considered an excellent predictor of mood for *temer(se)*.

Presupposed Mental Act (Indicative)	Presupposed comment (tendency towards indicative)	Non-presupposed (Subjunctive)	Total tokens
82/83 (98.77%) indicative as predicted	20/27 (74.07%) indicative as predicted	165/190 (86.84%) subjunctive as predicted	300

Table 3. Analysis of *Temer(se)* using the semantic Model A (Terrel and Hooper, 1974).

The following citations are examples of **non predicted outcomes** for presupposed mental act (25), comment (26) and non-presupposed instances (27):

(25) 161. *Y mucho más **nos tememos** que la Ley en absoluto **haya tenido** en cuenta cómo se resuelve el problema de estos deficientes para ir a una escuela normal, porque se nos dice que si va todo el mundo ¿por qué no va a ir un minusválido con silla de ruedas al colegio, como todo el mundo?* ‘In addition, we are afraid that the Law has not taken (Pres Perf SUBJ) into account how to resolve the problem caused by these deficiencies at all, since they tell us that if everybody goes to regular school, why not the handicapped in their wheel chairs, like everybody else?’ (papelesdelpsicologo.es/vernumero.asp?id=41, electronic version of a magazine, Spain) (Presupposed mental act: subjunctive)

The example above is the only one where a mental act had a subjunctive form in its subordinated clause. It is evident that the speakers in (25) are committed to the truth

expressed in the embedded clause (thus, presupposed) and are conveying a ‘weak’ assertion not an emotional comment to such plea. Now consider (26):

(26) 209. *Alejandro dejó un reguero de polémicas al criticar la gestión de Chávez y recordar que se está intentando recoger tres millones de firmas para que dimita. "Si se recogieran tres millones de firmas para que yo dejase de cantar, sin duda lo haría", parece que añadió, desafiante, el artista. El caso es que en Venezuela se inició de inmediato una suscripción, en Internet y hasta en la calle, para que Alejandro Sanz se dedique a otra cosa. La página web correspondiente tardó poco en reunir las primeras 20.000 firmas, pero los fans del cantante no temen que Chávez consiga retirarle de la escena.* “Alejandro left a considerable share of controversy when he criticized Chavez leadership [to remember] an attempt to collect 3 million signatures is being made to force Alejandro to quit his career...his fans **do not fear** that Chavez may get (Pres SUBJ) him out of business’ (<http://elpais.com/diario/2004/02/23/agenda>, Spain) (Presupposed, comment: subjunctive)

Terrel and Hooper (1974) had predicted that the type of comment clause in (26) is in transition from less use of subjunctive to absolute use of indicative forms in the future. 74% of these instances use indicative and it certainly seems that these authors are right. As far as *temer(se)* is concern, the pattern is undeniably going towards indicative forms in subordinated clauses.

Example (27) presents an unexpected use of an indicative form in non-presupposed statements:

(27) 219. *Quizás veamos más señales de repudio al viciado proceso electoral peruano, a pesar de la tímida reacción inicial de los países latinoamericanos. Estados Unidos, Canadá, Argentina y algunas otras democracias de la región temen que una regresión del Perú a un sistema totalitario podría alentar a otros aspirantes a presidentes vitalicios en la región a perpetuarse en el poder por medios poco democráticos.* ‘We may see more signs of disapproval of the corrupt election process in Peru, despite the timid initial response from other Latin American countries. the US, Canada, Argentina and some other regional democracies fear that a relapse into a totalitarian system in Peru could (Cond) encourage other presidential candidates in this area to stay in power using less democratic means to do so. (lanacion.com.ar/25269-la-soledad-de-alberto-fujimori, Andrés Oppenheimer, Argentina)

Non-presupposed items such as (27) represent (almost) two thirds of the total amount of tokens analyzed in this report. Thus, we can conclude that *temer(se)* clauses are most likely used in expressions where the speakers/subjects do not want to concede to the truth value of their statement. This ‘lack’ of commitment often gives these expressions a speculative overtone as the example (27) illustrates. The high percentage of subjunctive is undermined by a 13% of indicative usage in these items. This fact cannot be ignored and could represent a sign of an emerging mood alternation change among non-presupposed *temer(se)* clauses.

It is important to note that only a fraction of these tokens are used as comment clauses (27 out of 300 collected), followed by mental acts (83) and non-presupposed expressions (190). The reason for such disparity is that comment clauses in general are presupposed statements: *Me alegre que vayas a venir* ‘I’m happy that you are coming’ (speaker assumes that somebody is coming, thus committing to the truth of this statement and reacting to it with happiness). However, *temer(se)* clauses are more often than not non-presupposed: *(Me) temo que me vayas a dejar* ‘I fear/am afraid you are going to leave me’ (Speaker is not assuming the truth about the hearer leaving him/her, but he/she is reacting to it with fear). The latter makes this type of comment clause unique in its own right, since no other emotive complements are non-presupposed. This is also the reason the data was classified into these three different categories: *temer(se)* does not always convey a comment of a presupposed statement (comment clause), it also communicates the speakers’ disfranchisement from committing to the truth value of the predicate (non-presupposed) or the speakers’ attempt to indirectly assert a presupposed truth (mental act).

Thus far Model A seems to be a reliable tool to classify and analyze the data at hand. This Model has shown that mood alternation in *temer(se)* clauses is coming from a distinction between presupposed and non-presupposed expressions: presupposed items use or are trending to indicative and non-presupposed clauses use subjunctive.

Table 4 below presents the data classified using the pragmatic notions posited by Lunn (1989) which are part of Model B in this report. The category for old/less relevant information shows the predicted subjunctive outcome 61% of the time. However, in regards to the new/relevant information category, there is an unexpected use of subjunctive forms in almost 57% of the total items:

Old/less relevant information (Subjunctive)	New/relevant information (Indicative)	total tokens
33/54 (61.11% subjunctive as predicted)	Subjunctive 140/246 (56.91% subjunctive NOT as predicted)	300

Table 4. Analysis of *Temer(se)* using the pragmatic Model B (Lunn 1989).

The results given by Model B are less encouraging than those for Model A. Many of the occurrences where new information was conveyed are headlines in blogs, newspapers or magazines. There is not a more prominent place for relevant information than the news headline, but time after time in almost 57% of the cases analyzed, the speakers/writers used subjunctive forms. Even though old information has a predicted outcome of 61% subjunctive among 54 examples, it is not as strong as the percentages seen in Model A. Lunn (1989) analyzed relative clauses in a popular Spanish magazine and found that the headlines would introduce new information using preterit but when that information was elaborated in the body of the article, the writer switched to past



subjunctive (Cf. example (14) in page 15). The following example is similar to her findings among the *temer(se)* clauses:

(28) a. 144. **title:** Gerardo de Gracia (CCOO): "*Mucho **nos tememos** que aún no se ve el final del túnel de la crisis*" 'We fear/ are afraid that the end of the crisis is (Pres IND) not yet in sight'

b. 145. **text:** *La venta de viviendas ha caído más de un 30% en el último trimestre. Gerardo de Gracia, secretario general de la Federación Regional de Construcción de CCOO de Madrid, asegura que la crisis en el sector "ya la tenemos encima". Nada más que ver "el paro registrado". "Y mucho **nos tememos** que esto todavía **vaya** en aumento y aún no se **vea** el final del túnel".*

*Y Zapatero haciendo apañitos.* 'Real Estate sales are down 30% in the last quarter...and we are afraid that this trend may continue (Pres SUBJ) to grow and the end of the tunnel still may not be (Pres SUBJ) visible'

(<http://blogs.periodistadigital.com/dinero>, 24.06.08, Spain)

Example (28a, b) shows the clear switch between indicative and subjunctive that Lunn attested in her data for relative clauses: new information is given using indicative forms in the embedded statement (28a) and the same information mentioned in the body of the article following the headline is conveyed using subjunctive (28b). However, there are other examples that do not follow Lunn's prediction, for instance, consider (29a b) below:

(29) a. 225. **Title:** *Opositores **temen** que Montesinos **sig**a teniendo poder en Perú* 'Opponents fear/ are afraid that Montesinos may still have (Pres SUBJ) power in Peru'

b. 226. **Text:** *A una semana de la salida de Perú del ex jefe de los servicios de seguridad Vladimiro Montesinos, oponentes del gobierno reclaman la demolición de la estructura político-militar que le sirvió para controlar el poder, pues **temen** que aún la **maneje** desde el exilio.* 'One week after the departure of Vladimiro Montesinos, director of Security Services in Peru, opponents of the government are demanding the dismantling of the political and military structure that he used to control power [in this government agency] because they fear that he may still exert influence from exile. (El Nacional, newspaper, 2000, Venezuela)

Examples comparable to (29a) are very common in the data: headlines tend to use subjunctive forms. This fact directly contradicts Lunn and Haverkate's notion of backgrounding information by using subjunctive forms. Furthermore, the syntactic 'tilting', proposed by Haverkate, in which the speakers choose to highlight the main clause by using subjunctive in the embedded statement is also questionable in those cases: headliners are 'attention grabbers' regardless of their syntactic structures.

In summary, the notion of semantic presupposition used in Model A seems to have more predictive power than pragmatic presupposition, in Model B, at this point.

The following tables (5 and 6) present *temer(se)* as two separate items: *temer* and *temerse*. It was mentioned before that Haverkate (2002) observed a different pattern for each form and they are analyzed separate for that reason:

Presupposed Mental act (Indicative)		Presupposed Comment (tendency towards indicative)	Non-presupposed (Subjunctive)	Total tokens
<b>Temer</b>	16/16 (100%) indicative as predicted	10/15 (66.66%) indicative as predicted	150/158 (94.93%) subjunctive as predicted	189
<b>Temerse</b>	66/67 (98.50%) indicative as predicted	10/12 (83.33%) indicative as predicted	<b>17/32</b> (53%) indicative NOT as predicted	111
Totals	82	27	190	<b>300</b>

Table 5. Analysis of *temer(se)* by verb type using Model A (Terrel and Hooper, 1974)

The data presented above regarding *temer* does not give any unexpected results: mental acts exhibit 100% indicative use, presupposed comment clauses show almost 67% of indicative usage and non-presupposed items use subjunctive 95% of the time. *Temerse* seems to follow the previous pattern as well: 98% of the total mental acts use indicative and 83% of the presupposed comment items use indicative also. The unanticipated results come from the non-presupposed items, where 53% of them use indicative.

It is important to note that *temer* and *temerse* display a peculiarity that cannot be overlooked: table 5 also shows that *temer* is frequently used to express non-presupposed statements (158 out of 189 *temer* samples) while *temerse* is more frequently used to present mental acts (67 out of 111 *temerse* tokens). It is possible to claim that there is a division of labor between the pronominal and its counterpart: *temer* is used in non-presupposed predicates (subjunctive) and *temerse* in presupposed statements (indicative). This finding sheds some light regarding the usage of mood in these expressions where the notion of presupposition seems to hold a greater value than that of old/new information does.

Model A stands out as a good predictor of mood choice, except in the case of non-presupposed instances for *temerse*. The next items are some of the examples that were **unexpected outcomes** for these categories under the Model A analysis: (example (25) is the only instance of mental act using a subjunctive form and it is shown again for clarity)

(25) 161. *Y mucho más **nos tememos** que la Ley en absoluto **haya tenido** en cuenta cómo se resuelve el problema de estos deficientes para ir a una escuela normal, porque se nos dice que si va todo el mundo ¿por qué no va a ir un minusválido con silla de ruedas al colegio, como todo el mundo?* ‘In addition, we are afraid that the Law has not taken (Pres Perf SUBJ) into account how to resolve the problem caused by these deficiencies at all, since they tell us that if everybody goes to regular school, why not the handicapped in their wheel chairs, like

everybody else?’ (papelesdelpsicologo.es/vernumero.asp?id=41, electronic version of a magazine, Spain) (Presupposed mental act: subjunctive)

(30) 41. 26 Feb 2009 ... Puma Carranza: “**No temo que me digan** cachudo porque estoy separado” ‘I don’t fear/am not afraid of people calling me (Pres SUBJ) a cuckold because I am estranged from my wife’ (Headline in <http://peru21.pe/noticia>, Peru) (Presupposed comment: subjunctive)

(31) 266. *Pero la rebaja de los tipos no creo que vaya a afectar mucho a la inversión productiva, cuyo principal problema en este momento no es el del coste del dinero, sino la existencia de incertidumbres profundas que no se despejan. Sin embargo, mucho **me temo que puede** significar una inyección inflacionista adicional para la economía española*”... ‘Nonetheless, the price reduction will not have much affect on productive investment...however I fear/am afraid that this could mean (Pres IND) an additional inflation trigger for Spain’s economic struggles (Faro de Vigo, 22/11/2002, Press, Spain) (non-presupposed: indicative)

Model A still shows a strong standing as a better predictor of mood, showing consistency even when *temer(se)* is separated into pronominal and non-pronominal categories. However, the observation made by Haverkate about *temerse* is confirmed: despite the foreseen use of subjunctive for *temerse* in non-presupposed items, it has a clear and strong tendency toward indicative forms, not only in non-presupposed clauses but across the board. His claim about *temer* is a different story: it displays a strong usage of indicative and not a solid trend to use subjunctive (as this author claimed was the case).

Table 6 below exhibits the results using Model B. The predicted outcome for old information items happens in *temer* with a strong trend to subjunctive use (83%) and for new information tokens in *temerse* with a definite tendency to indicative forms (88.5%). The unpredicted outputs come from the use of subjunctive forms in new information samples for *temer* (81%) and indicative use in old information for *temerse* (66%). Under this classification Haverkate’s claims are confirmed: *temer* trends to subjunctive and *temerse* to indicative forms despite the old/new information assessment of the statement.

However, Lunn and Haverkate's predictions based on those notions are **not validated** in this study: it is clear from the results that the nature of the information (old or new) is not a trigger factor of the mood being chosen. Nonetheless, there is an evident pattern of choice with respect to *temer* and *temerse*:

Old/less or non relevant information (Subjunctive)		New/relevant information (Indicative)	Total tokens
<b>Temer</b>	25/30 (83.33%) <b>subjunctive</b> as predicted	130/159 (81.76%) <b>subjunctive</b> NOT as predicted	189
<b>Temerse</b>	16/24 (66.66%) <b>indicative</b> NOT as predicted	77/87 (88.50%) <b>indicative</b> as predicted	111
Totals	54	246	<b>300</b>

Table 6. Analysis of *temer(se)* by verb type using model B (Lunn, 1989, 1995)

In summary, Model B does not explain the indicative/subjunctive usage as well as Model A does. The *temer* and *temerse* trend seen above seems to be better explained in terms of presupposed vs. non-presupposed statements (Cf. table 5). The pragmatic notions of new and old information worked for Lunn's data but not for this comment clause cases.

The next examples are unexpected results for Model B in which the pronominal *temerse* conveys new information using subjunctive:

(32) 108. *Los Yébenes (Toledo). Mucho **nos tememos** que la magnífica novillada con que nos sorprendió el Sr. Medina en el otoño pasado **fuera** flor de un día. En el 2002 hemos visto en Madrid dos veces a esta ganadería, novillada y corrida, con un saldo totalmente negativo; únicamente en su haber que la novillada se*

*despachó (dentro de la mansedumbre) con 15 varas, cosa ésta que ya no se lleva...* ‘...**we fear/are afraid** that the outstanding young bulls, with which Mr. Medina surprised all of us last fall, **was** (Past SUBJ) a onetime occurrence. In 2002 we’ve seen this cattle twice in Madrid....(n° 20, 10/2002, La Voz de la Afición, Press, Spain)

In example (33) the pronominal *temerse* expresses old information using indicative, an unforeseen outcome:

(33) 124... *y ella, con un acusado sentido de la disciplina cultivado durante veintiséis años de militancia en el PSOE y la UGT, aceptó, a sabiendas de que le tocaba porque no habían querido Alfonso Guerra ni Juan Carlos Rodríguez Ibarra ni José Borrell, y de que se trataba de presentarse para perder. Sabía que estaba en el cuarto lugar de la lista confeccionada por Guerra y que los tres que la precedían se habían ido descolgando, así que no la cogió por sorpresa que, a mediados de abril, "el jefe" -como llama al ex vicesecretario general- la avisara para que se fuera preparando.*

- *Si esto sigue así, te va a tocar -le dijo en una conversación telefónica.*

*A medida que quienes la precedían se iban descartando, aumentaban también los que decían que debía ser ella la candidata. Algunos de los más próximos, como el cántabro Jaime Blanco y el madrileño José Acosta, ya la habían sondeado con el consabido "nos tememos que vas a tener que ser tú" ‘...she accepted knowing full well that she was 4<sup>th</sup> in the list...she wasn’t surprised at all about their decision since they have already told her “we fear/ are afraid you are going to be (Fut) the chosen one...” (El relevo. Crónica viva del camino hacia el II Suresnes del PSOE, Gonzalo López Alba, 2000, Spain)*

The following two examples present unexpected instances for non pronominal *temer*. Example (34) presents linked tokens 149 and 150; the former conveys new information and the later old information, both of them use an indicative form:

(34) 149. *El personal de relaciones públicas del Banco Mundial enfrenta ahora el reto de convencer a la gente de que el nuevo presidente es independiente de la Administración Bush y sus políticas controversiales. **Tememos que "democracia" estará** entre las palabras de moda en el Banco, y será la base para establecer una nueva serie de condicionamientos, principalmente en el Medio Oriente. ‘we fear/are afraid that ‘democracy’ **will be** (Fut) one of those fashionable words in the Bank’s repertoire and will be the foundation to establish a new series of conditionings mainly in the Middle East...*

150. *Tememos que será usada no para ayudar a crear espacios para que la gente escoja sus propios sistemas económicos y modelos de desarrollo, sino como cubierta para imponer normas que prioricen la inversión extranjera y la liberalización de los mercados por encima de todo, y para debilitar y desacreditar a los gobiernos que decidan reconocer las prioridades de sus ciudadanos sobre los intereses empresariales.* ‘**We fear/are afraid** [the word ‘democracy’] **will be** (Fut) used not to help in creating freedom for people to chose their own economic system and development models, but to covertly impose rules prioritizing foreign investments and free markets above all ...’(from: <http://www.globalizacion.org/ciudadania/SocCivilCartaWolfowitz.htm> )

Examples like (34), which present *temer* expressing old information with an indicative form, are not a common occurrence: there are only 5 tokens, roughly 17% of the total Old information category in table 6. On the other hand, *temer* displays a high incidence of subjunctive when used to convey new information and (35) and (36) below are only two of 130 samples available (out of the 159 total tokens for this category, Cf. table 6):

(35)157. *Si en nuestro sueño vemos a un merodeador, significa que **tememos** que alguien nos **robe** algo importante* ‘If in our dream we see a stalker, it means that **we fear/are afraid** somebody **might steal** (Pres SUBJ) something important...’ (<http://nelamoxtli.com/robar.html>, no date available, Mexico)

(36) 181. *El problema, consideran algunos observadores, como el propio director general de la APDN, Driss Benhima, es que en zonas de regadío la rentabilidad del cultivo del cánnabis es 12 veces superior a la del cereal o las leguminosas. Así las cosas, algunos de estos observadores **temen** que el norte de Marruecos se **esté** convirtiendo poco a poco en una suerte de "Colombia del Magreb".* ‘The problem...is that the profit from cannabis plantations is 12 times higher than that for other crops like cereal and vegetables, thus some of these officials **fear/are afraid** the north of Morocco **may be** (Pres SUBJ) slowly becoming the ‘Colombia’ of the Maghreb’ ([lavozdegalicia.es/hemeroteca/2004/01/14](http://lavozdegalicia.es/hemeroteca/2004/01/14), Spain)

The results presented in tables 3 to 6 above have shown Model A to be better than Model B with respect to predicting and decoding the mood choice in fear comment clauses (table 3). Nonetheless, model A shows signs of ineffectiveness when *temer(se)* is analyzed in its pronominal *temerse* and non-pronominal *temer* form (table 5). The next section will summarize these findings.



## CONCLUSION

The dynamic mood alternation attested in some syntactic environments, particularly emotive embedded clauses, has been one of the main concerns among scholars who study the Spanish language. Spanish mood alternation in those cases is challenging because it seems to be unsystematic, unpredictable, and thus difficult to comprehend and teach to second language learners.

Many scholars have attempted to explain this phenomenon from different points of view, as it was mentioned in previous sections. One of the goals of this report was to answer research question 1: Is there a viable analysis model one can utilize to better understand mood alternation in fear and possibly other comment clauses? In order to answer it, two promising analyses were chosen with regards to predicting and deciphering the patterns of this mood variation: Model A which uses the semantic notion of presupposition; and Model B which uses the pragmatic notion of old/new information.

Research question 1 was partially answered: Model B proved to be useless in providing a clear explanation of the results presented in the analysis. There seems to be no correlation between old information and subjunctive usage and new information and indicative. These pragmatic notions are not the reasons behind this mood variation and it is evident in tables 3 and 5. As a result, at least in the case of fear predicates, there is no value in the notions of new vs. old information in order to decode mood variation in this case. It is possible that other comment clauses will be better understood using the notions of old vs. new information, and, for this reason, we should not disregard Model B just yet.

With regards to Model A, it stands as a partially viable option to analyze mood variation in this and other comment clause cases. This model successfully showed a possible correlation between presupposed/indicative forms and non-presupposed/subjunctive ones (Cf. tables 2 and 4 in previous section). Despite the promising results obtained by using Model A, it did not deliver a complete understanding of the mood trends seen in the data. Table 2 presents a clear connection between presupposition and mood variation for fear predicates, however, when *temer(se)* is analyzed as pronominal/non pronominal, the results change enough to cast doubts about this correlation (Cf. table 4). These unexpected results shake the core assumption that presupposition is behind the choice of mood made by speakers. The two verb forms used for this fear clause probably need to be analyzed farther on using other notions or models that can clarify the mood usage patterns attested. This means that, albeit the positive general results gathered with Model A, the search for an analysis that can properly account for these patterns is not over yet. It is still important to consider this model with other comment clauses as well.

As it is stated in the paragraph above, one cannot disqualify this analysis either. Model A may be able to successfully clarify the mood alternation for other comment clauses because each of them has unique morpho-syntactic features. It has been previously mentioned that not all comment clauses are created equal, thus many of them do not have a (non) pronominal counterpart and take different clauses as complements. Another important characteristic that sets apart fear from other emotive clauses is their non-presupposed nature: for the most part, fear predicates are usually non-presupposed. You fear what may come to pass but you cannot abide by its truth value since it is a plausible but uncertain event. One syntactic feature that came to light when gathering the

data was the ability of fear matrices to be postposed: embedded clause + main clause as in *No nos van a dar las becas en enero, me temo*, ‘They are not going to give us the scholarships in January, **I’m afraid/I fear**’. No other comment clause shares this characteristic, consequently, it is important to analyze the other emotive clauses under the light of these two models.

Research question 2 was also partially answered: Is it feasible to predict mood choice within fear clauses using one of those authors’ models? Model B was not useful in predicting mood choice. It has been stated above that there is no correlation between the mood trend and the notions of new/old information. Model A appears to be the most promising of the two analyses selected in this report: one can predict the use of indicative in the embedded clause if the predicate is presupposed and subjunctive if the sentence is non-presupposed, for the most part.

*Temerse* displays a disparity that cannot be overlooked: according to our Model A, non-presupposed instances should use subjunctive forms, but, in this case, 53% of the tokens use indicative instead. This unforeseen outcome casts doubt in our analysis because this trend is not captured accurately by this model. Other considerations should/must be taken into account in order to properly decode *temerse* patterns. The functional (pragmatic?) perspective might hold more clues to the *temer(se)* variation but it is out of the scope of this analysis, i.e the evolution of *temerse* from comment clause to discourse marker. Further investigation is needed in order to shed more light on this fact. One interesting fact is that Haverkate **observed** the *temer(se)* tendencies which were confirmed by my study, however, he did not predict them from the pragmatic notions of new and old information. His own data survey yielded those results, although he does not mention a number of tokens, it was clearly not a result from his analysis.

In general Lunn's model analysis is not valuable for the decoding and prediction of mood choice with regards to fear clauses. Terrel and Hooper's analysis yields better results but not a completely tight account of the alternations. It is important to take these models into account for the examination of other comment clauses due to the morpho-syntactic diversity displayed by this class of predicates.

One promising lead to study in more detail is the pronominal *temerse*. The unexpected results suggest that there may be other factors that contribute to the mood alternation behavior displayed by this item. One of the linguistic fields that could shed light about *temerse* is Pragmatics because this pronominal verb seems to exhibit some of the basic features associated with 'discourse markers'. Some of those features could be expounded regarding this verbal phrase and the mood variation in its complements:

- The adverbial capabilities cited by Bolinger (1968) for the English phrase 'I'm afraid'<sup>9</sup> are also possible for *me temo que*: *desafortunadamente/desgraciadamente* and are part of the 'pragmaticalization' path in discourse markers. In other words, some expressions (being single words or phrases) go through a decategorialization process: verbal phrase > adverbial expression.
- The pragmatic (not propositional) meaning mentioned by Haverkate 2002 is also an important attribute of discourse markers: This scholar mentions that *me temo que* can be used as a polite strategy for speakers who desire to soften their assertions<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. page 4.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. page 9. Other Spanish verbal phrases that have acquired a pragmatic meanings are: *o sea, digo yo, dizque* and *ándale*, just to mention a few.

- The ambiguity of the ‘reflexive’ clitic: there is no clear semantic, syntactic or grammatical function for the reflexive particle in *temerse*. It is not an indirect object, reflexive referent or an anticausative marker. This is a distinct feature in other discourse markers as well.
- The syntactic optionality of this phrase has been observed by Haverkate when it is used as a strategy to be less direct<sup>11</sup>. This characteristic is also shared by other discourse markers and denotes the lack of a clear syntactic and grammatical function; thus the rest of the phrase does not become ungrammatical by its absence, i.e. *(me temo que) estás equivocado compadre* (‘I’m afraid/fear that) you are wrong compadre’

The peculiarities presented above are all related to the use of indicative in the fear clause complement. They seem to be connected to one verbal inflexion in particular in the main matrix as well: 1<sup>st</sup> person singular *me temo*. However, this report did not separate the different inflexions gathered for the analysis of *temerse* and this fact should be considered in further research. The indicative/subjunctive alternation displayed by this pronominal form might be linked to ongoing (pragmatic?) changes in one of these inflexions in particular and could be the reason behind the attested mood variation, the unexpected result that neither Model A or B could fully explain. It is possible to scrutinize farther to find out if the rest of the verbal inflexions favor the use of subjunctive as a result of the alleged changes in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular form.

The speculations presented above should also encourage future interest in other comment clauses. The syntactic and morphological diversity of these phrases is very puzzling and considering them as a homogeneous group is a mistake that clouds

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. page 9

important differences regarding mood variation. Although all of them present a different but attested degree of mood alternation, their patterns might be linked to the relevance of the information given (Model B), the semantic nuances (Model A) or it may be associated to other factors like the pragmatic characteristics mentioned above for fear clauses. It is more productive to explore them one by one than to cluster them together as this has been the customary way scholars have analyzed emotive clauses to this day.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahern, Aoife, & Leonetti, Manuel. (2004). The Spanish subjunctive: Procedural semantics and pragmatic inference. In Rosina Márquez-Reiter & María Elena Placencia (Eds.), *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish* (Vol. 123, pp. 35-56). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bello, Andrés. (1847). *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (Vol. 1). Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Blake, Robert J. (1981). *Some Empirically based Observations on Adult Usage of the Subjunctive Mood in Mexico City*. Benson collection in UT Austin.
- Blake, Robert J. (1985). From Research to the Classroom: Notes on the Subjunctive. [Peer reviewed]. *Hispania*, 68(1, Mar.), 166-173.
- Bolinger, Dwight. (1953). Verbs of Emotion. *Hispania*, 36(4), 459-461.
- Bolinger, Dwight. (1968). Postposed main phrases: an English rule for the Romance subjunctive. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 4-30 p.
- Haverkate, Henk. (2002). *The Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of Spanish Mood* (N/A, Trans. 2002 ed. Vol. 96). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jary, Mark. (2009). Relevance, assertion and possible worlds: a cognitive approach to the Spanish subjunctive. In Phillip de Brabanter (Ed.), *Utterance interpretation and cognitive models* (Vol. 20, pp. 1-40): Emerald Publishing.
- Klein-Andreu, Flora. (1991). Losing ground: a discourse-pragmatic solution to the history of -ra in Spanish. In Suzanne Fleischman & Linda R. Waugh (Eds.), *Discourse Pragmatics and the Verb* (First ed., pp. 164-178). London: Routledge.
- Lavandera, Beatriz R. (1983). Shifting Moods in Spanish Discourse *Discourse Perspectives on Syntax* (pp. 209-236).
- Lemon, Francis. (1927). A psychological study on the subjunctive in Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 11(4), 195-199.
- Lunn, Patricia. (1989). Spanish mood and the prototype of assertability. *Linguistics*, 27, 687-702.
- Lunn, Patricia. (1995). The Evaluative Function of the Spanish Subjunctive. In Joan Bybee & Suzanne Fleishman (Eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse* (Vol. 32, pp. 429-449): John Benjamins.
- Lynch, Andrew E. (1999). *The Subjunctive in Miami Cuban Spanish: Bilingualism, Contact and Language Variability*. PhD Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Quer, Josep. (2009). Twist of mood: the distribution and interpretation of indicative and subjunctive. *Lingua*, 119, 1779-1787.
- Real Academia Española de la Lengua. (2009). *Nueva Gramática de la lengua española* (Vol. 1). Madrid: Espasa.
- Siegel, Laura. (2009). Mood selection in Romance and Balkan. *Lingua*, 119, 1859-1882.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Takagaki, Toshihiro. (1984). Subjunctive as the marker of subordination. *Hispania*, 67(2), 248-256.
- Terrel, Tracy. (1976). Assertion and presupposition in Spanish. In Martha Luján & Fritz Hensey (Eds.), *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics* (pp. 221-245). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Terrel, Tracy, & Hooper, Joan (1974). A Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, 57(3, Sept.), 484-494.
- Veidmark, Ross, & Umaña Aguiar, Ronald & Jeanina. (1991). La desaparición del subjuntivo español y sus implicaciones para el cambio lingüístico. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica*, 17(1-2), 193-202.
- Villalta, Elisabeth. (2008). Mood and gradability: an investigation of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. *Linguist and Philos*, 31, 467-522.